(d) Consignments of imported food articles are to be checked/ analyzed by the Custom authorities to ensure the compliance of provisions of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 and the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955 and Packaged Commodities Rules, 1977, before releasing the same for human consumption in the country.

(e) and (f) The States/ Union Territories Governments who are responsible for enforcement of the provisions of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 and rules made thereunder are taking random samples of different articles of food including imported food available in the market and take necessary penal action against the offenders under the law for any violation. The Food (Health)Authorities of the States/Union Territories have been advised from time to time to keep a strict vigil and quality of different food articles sold in market and take penal action against the offender for any violation of the provisions of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 and rules made thereunder.

**Implementation of NFSA**

2516. SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Competent Authority has implemented National Food Security Act;

(b) if so, the details and the present status thereof;

(c) whether quantity of foodgrains now allotted to BPL families will be reduced after the implementation of National Food Security Act;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) whether alterations in the National Food Security Act had been suggested by State Governments/agencies/individuals; and

(f) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) to (f) At present Government is examining various aspects of the proposed National Food Security Act (NFSA), including number of Below Poverty Line families to be covered, scale of issue of foodgrains, etc in consultation with various stake-holders.

Based on a concept note circulated to State/Union Territory Governments on the proposed law, their responses have been received. They are also under examination.

**Hoarding and black-marketing of essential commodities**

2517. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether hoarding and black marketing of essential commodities is rampant in the country leading to their shortage and rise in prices;

(b) if so, the details thereof indicating current demand and supply situation of these commodities in the country;

(c) whether State Governments have been directed to ensure declaration of excess stocks by wholesallers and take action against hoarders and black marketeers; and

(d) if so, the details thereof indicating steps taken by States to enforce the provisions of the Essential Commodities Act alongwith the number of raids conducted, hoarders arrested and goods confiscated during current year, Statewise, till date?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) to (d) The prices of some essential commodities have risen during the current year. Prices have risen on account of various factors like poor rainfall, high international prices, rising demand etc. In commodities like pulses and edible oils, imports take place every year because domestic production is not sufficient; 15-20% of pulses and 40-45% of edible oils are imported to meet the domestic demand. In the case of rice, due to poor monsoon, kharif production is likely to be lower than the demand. Similarly in the case of sugar, production has fallen short of demand in 2008-09.

In order to check hoarding and blackmarketing, the Government of India has taken the following steps:-

(i) Powers have been vested with State Governments for taking action under the provisions of Essential Commodities Act, 1955 and Prevention of Blackmarketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980.

(ii) To enable the State Govemments/UT Administrations to take effective action for undertaking de-hoarding operations under the Essential Commodities Act., 1955, it was decided to enable State Governments to impose stockholding limits by keeping in abeyance some provisions of the Central Order dated 15.02.2002 in respect of pulses, edible oils, edible oilseeds, rice and paddy for the period upto 30.09.2010. The commodity wheat which had also been included in the above list has been removed *w.e.f.* 01.04.2009.

(iii) Further, in respect of sugar, the Central Government have also issued Orders providing for stock-holding/turnover limits which are as follows:

Stockholding:

**(i) in Kolkata and extended area -**

(a) recognized dealers who import sugar from outside West Bengal - 10,000 quintals;

(b) other recognized dealers - 2000 quintals;

(ii) in other places - 2000 quintals.

Turnover: No dealer can hold the stock of sugar for a period exceeding 30 days from the date of receipt by him of such stock.

(iv) The details of the raids conducted, value of goods confiscated and persons booked for violation of rules under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, during the year 2009 (updated upto 30.11.2009) as reported by State Governments/UT Administrations is given in Statement *(See* below).

(v) The State Governments/UT Administrations are empowered to detain such persons under the Prevention of Blackmarketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980, whose activities are found to be prejudicial to the maintenance of supplies of commodities essential to the community. Details of detention orders issued under the said Act and as reported to the Central Government by the State Governments/UT Administrations during the year 2009 (upto 30.11.2009) is given below:-

| Name of the State | 2009 (upto 30.11.2009) |
|---|---|
| Gujarat | 26 |
| Tamil Nadu | 107 |
| Orissa | 02 |
| Maharashtra | 02 |
| TOTAL | 137 |

(vi) The State Governments/UT Administrations have been repeatedly advised to strictly enforce both the Acts and also monitor such enforcements.

***Statement***

*Action taken under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 for the year - 2009 - Information received from States/UTs*

upto 30.11.2009

| Sl.No. | State/UTs | No.of Raids | No.of persons arrested | No. of persons prose-cuted | No. of persons con-victed | Value of goods confis-cated in Rs. Lakh | Reported upto |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 6139 | 1 | Nil | 1 | 102.06 | September |
| 2 | Assam | 2025 | 2 | Nil | Nil | Nil | July |
| 3 | Arunachal Pradesh | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | July |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Bihar | 4 | 2 | Nil | Nil | Nil | August |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 160 | 31 | 12 | 5 | 330.95 | April |
| 6 | Delhi | 80 | 50 | 67 | Nil | Nil | October |
| 7 | Gujarat | 21281 | 21 | 74 | Nil | 480.72 | October |
| 8 | Goa | 30 | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | October |
| 9 | Haryana | 58 | 2 | Nil | Nil | Nil | July |
| 10 | Himachal Pradesh | 14946 | 3 | 2 | Nil | 6.28 | July |
| 11 | Jammu & Kashmir | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 12 | Jharkhand | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 13 | Karnataka | 881 | 39 | 5 | 2 | 22.68 | July |
| 14 | Kerala | 36231 | 21 | 2 | Nil | 26.4 | September |
| 15 | Madhya Pradesh | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 16 | Maharashtra | 1011 | 1639 | 1008 | Nil | 12500.87 | August |
| 17 | Manipur | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | September |
| 18 | Meghalaya | 8 | Nil | 4 | Nil | Nil | September |
| 19 | Mizoram | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 20 | Nagaland | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | August |
| 21 | Orissa | 12577 | 7 | 25 | Nil | 3.08 | September |
| 22 | Punjab | 65 | 46 | 29 | 21 | 462.74 | September |
| 23 | Rajasthan | 281 | 3 | 62 | Nil | 36.89 | March |
| 24 | Sikkim | Nil | Nil | Nil | | Nil | September |
| 25 | Tamil Nadu | 13189 | 3926 | 1143 | 4 | 497.4 | October |
| 26 | Tripura | 5 | 2 | 2 | Nil | 0.31 | September |
| 27 | Uttaranchal | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 28 | Uttar Pradesh | 22315 | 514 | 860 | Nil | 979.93 | July |
| 29 | West Bengal | 94 | 69 | 2 | Nil | 44.89 | September * |
| 30 | A & N Islands | 148 | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | October |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | Chandigarh | 7 | 7 | Nil | Nil | 7.93 | August |
| 32 | D & N Haveli | 3 | 2 | Nil | Nil | 0.22 | October |
| 33 | Daman & Diu | | | | | | Not Reported |
| 34 | Lakshadweep | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | October |
| 35 | Pondicherry | 357 | 49 | 54 | 13 | 15.12 | October |
| | TOTAL | 131875 | 6436 | 3351 | 46 | 15518.47 | |

* - Except - May

Updated as on 4.12.2009

**Fair and remunerative price for sugarcane**

2518. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has recently introduced changes in the sugarcane pricing norms under Fair and Remunerative Price (FRP);

(b) if so, the details thereof along with the benefits likely to accrue to farmers who were agitating in this regard;

(c) whether farmers have raised any objections; if so, the details thereof; and

(d) the remedial steps Government has taken or propose to take in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) Yes Sir. The Central Government had been fixing the Statutory Minimum Price (SMP) of sugarcane under the provisions of the Clause 3 of Sugarcane (Control) Order, 1966 (SCO) having regard to different criteria. The Sugarcane (Control) Order, 1966 has been further amended on 22nd October 2009 by inserting clause (g) which provided for giving reasonable margins to the growers of sugarcane on account of risk and profits. Powers were given to the Central Government to fix a fair and remunerative price (FRP). Accordingly, the FRP payable by sugar mills for 2009-10 sugar season has been fixed at Rs.129.84 per quintal, linked to a basic recovery rate of 9.5% subject to a premium of Rs.1.37 for every Rs. 0.1 percentage point increase in recovery above that level. The FRP fixed at Rs. 129.84 per quintal for 2009-10 sugar season is about 51% higher than the SMP of sugarcane of 2008-09 calculated at 9.5% basic recovery rate.

(c) and (d) There is one representation from farmers' association in this regard. According to the representation and the media reports, there is misapprehension amongst a section of farmers that the FRP is the maximum price of sugarcane above which they are not entitled to get a price for